



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

11A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,009	10/14/2003	Michael D. Gerdes	HE 8698US	4282
1688	7590	03/09/2007	EXAMINER	
POLSTER, LIEDER, WOODRUFF & LUCCHESI 12412 POWERSCOURT DRIVE SUITE 200 ST. LOUIS, MO 63131-3615			REIS, TRAVIS M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2859	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	03/09/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/685,009	GERDES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Travis M. Reis	2859

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7,9,20-31,34-37,39-43 and 60-70 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-7,29-31,34-37,39-43,60 and 65-67 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 2 and 9 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3,20-28,61-63 and 68-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3, 20-28, 61-64, & 68-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell (U.S. Patent 3888128) in view of Mieling (U.S. Patent 5471754).

With reference to claims 1, 3, 20-24, 26-28, & 61-64 Mitchell discloses a system, and method of using an adjustable mounting flange (10) for mounting vehicle wheels (19) each having different lug patterns on the shaft of a balancing machine (15) which comprises a flange plate (34) having a central bore extending from a front face to a rear face (Figure 2); an adjusting plate (35) disposed adjacent said rear face and coupled to said flange plate for coaxial rotational movement relative to said flange plate (Figure 4) and wherein said plates are rotated relative to each other as part of the alignment process to common radial positions simultaneously (col. 3 lines 39-42); a plurality of slots passing through said flange plate(37); a plurality of circumferentially equidistant slots passing through said adjusting plate(38); a plurality of mounting pins (30), each of said plurality of mounting pins including a guide pin (28) adapted for engagement with said flange plate and a contact tip (31) adapted for engagement with each of the plurality of wheel lug holes, wherein said each of said slot sets are arranged in annular patterns (Figure 4-6) with identifying indicia (48) being associated a slot; and wherein said plurality of slots in said flange plate and said plurality of slots in said adjusting plate cooperatively define one or more sets of unobstructed passages and corresponding to each lug hole in a wheel lug pattern through said adjustable mounting flange (Figure 4); and wherein

each of said unobstructed passages in a set of unobstructed passages is disposed at a common radial distance from an axis of said central bore (Figure 5), said common radial distance associated with a rotational position of said adjusting plate, wherein said rotation of said adjusting plate relative to the flange plate alters the radial position of each of said unobstructed passages and plurality of guide pins simultaneously (col. 3 lines 39-42); wherein said plurality of slots passing through said flange plate include at least one set of circumferentially equidistant spaced slots, said slots in said set having a common skewed configuration and wherein the adjusting plate has a different common skewed configuration (Figure 4); wherein a range of rotational movement of said adjusting plate about said central axis corresponds with a range of radial movement of each of said unobstructed passages in said set of unobstructed passages between an inner radial position and an outer radial position (Figure 4).

Mitchell does not disclose said mounting flange assembly is a single plate with at least three different vehicle wheel lug hole configurations including at least three lug holes, each lug hole configuration having a different number of lug holes.

Mieling discloses a kit to align wheels of a vehicle including a single flange plate (33) with at least three different vehicle wheel lug hole configurations including at least three lug holes (34-37, 44-47), each lug hole configuration having a different number of lug holes (col. 7 lines 49-59) (Figures 1 & 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to replace the mounting flange plates disclosed by Mitchell with the single flange plate disclosed by Mieling in order to be able to service different vehicle wheels without switching the flange plate and save time.

With reference to claim 25, Mitchell does not disclose indicia associated with each slot. However, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an indicia associated with each slot, since it has been held that

the mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to add an indicia to every slot in order to be able to read the indicia if the other slots are obscured.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 2 & 9 are allowed.
4. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The prior art of record does not disclose or clearly suggest a system for mounting vehicle wheels each having an axial pilot hole and a plurality of radial spaced lug holes disposed in one of a plurality of symmetric and axially centered configurations, about a spindle shaft of a vehicle wheel balancer comprising one double tapered centering cone having a first tapered surface increasing in diameter from a first end, and a second tapered surface increasing in diameter from a second end axially opposite said first end, in combination with the remaining limitations in the claims.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 20-28, 61-64, & 68-70 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Blair discloses a tire mounting device (U.S. Patent 6349593).

Art Unit: 2859

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Travis M. Reis whose telephone number is (571) 272-2249. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diego Gutierrez can be reached on (571) 272-2245. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Travis M Reis
Examiner
Art Unit 2859

tmr
March 2, 2007



RICHARD SMITH
PRIMARY EXAMINER